DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 907 TM 003 461

AUTHOR Durward, M. Lynne; Ellis, E. N.
TITLE An Evaluation of Computerized Report Cards in Vancouver Secondary Schools.
INSTITUTION Vancouver Board of School Trustees (British Columbia). Dept. of Planning and Evaluation.
REPORT NO RR-73-07
PUB DATE May 73
NOTE 58p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Academic Records; *Computer Oriented Programs; Counselor Attitudes; *Grades (Scholastic); *Grading; Parent Attitudes; *Report Cards; School Surveys; Secondary School Students; *Student Evaluation; Student Records; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Canada

ABSTRACT

Seven Vancouver secondary schools presently using Computerized report cards participated in the study. Parents and school staff members were administered questionnaires regarding the computer generated reports. The study concluded that a report of academic progress was the primary concern of parents and 77.4% of the parents were generally satisfied with the computerized report cards employing the existing system of using letter grades and teachers' comments by subject although both parents (54%) and school staff (84.8%) wanted provision on the report card for two or more comments per course. Teachers and administrators believed that more students received comments under the computerized system than under the manual system, but that the range of comments was narrower, and the number of comments per course for each student was less with computerized report cards. (RC)

ED 088907

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 088907

AN EVALUATION OF COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS IN VANCOUVER SECONDARY SCHOOLS

May 1, 1973

M. Lynne Durward

and

E. N. Ellis

Research Report 73-07

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Department of Planning and Evaluation gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Mr. Wayne Dodds, Computer Consultant, in many aspects of this study.

AN EVALUATION OF COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS IN VANCOUVER SECONDARY SCHOOLS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
LIST OF TABLES	iii
A. INTRODUCTION	1
B. METHODOLOGY	4
C. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO PARENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS USING COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS	4
D. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES RE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS BY ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, COUNSELLORS, COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND CLERICAL STAFF	13
E. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS	32
F. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS OF THE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARD SYSTEM	33
APPENDIX A--REPORT TO PARENTS	37
APPENDIX B--SUBJECT SECTION/MARKS GATHERING FORM	38
APPENDIX C--NUMERIC CODES FOR COMMENTS, COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS	39
APPENDIX D--QUESTIONNAIRE TO PARENTS OF STUDENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS	41
APPENDIX E--QUESTIONNAIRE TO TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS RE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS	43
APPENDIX F--QUESTIONNAIRE TO COUNSELLORS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS RE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS	45
APPENDIX G--QUESTIONNAIRE TO CLERICAL STAFF RE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS	47
BIBLIOGRAPHY	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Weighted Mean Priorities and Numerical Ranks Assigned by Parents of Secondary Students for Five Questions (Item 1)	5
II	Responses of Parents of Seven Secondary Schools to Item 2: "How do you find the report card?"	5
III	Responses of Parents of Secondary Students to Item 3	6
IV	Responses of Parents of Secondary Students to Item 4: "Which of the Following Reporting Systems Do You Prefer for Indicating Progress?"	7
V	Responses of Parents of Secondary Students to Item 5: "Which Method of Reporting Do you Like Best?"	8
VI	Responses of Parents to Item 6 Regarding the Number of Parent-Teacher Conferences	8
VII	Summary of Parents' Responses to Item 7 Re the Number of Computerized Comments	9
VIII	Responses of Parents to Item 8: "How Many Times During the Year Would You Like to have a Report on Your Son's/Daughter's Progress in School?	10
IX	Responses of Parents to Item 9, "In General, Are you Satisfied with the Report Card?"	10
X	Responses of Parents to Item 10, "Do you Wish to be Told the Number of Days that Your Son/Daughter has Been Absent from School?"	11
XI	Responses of Parents to Item 11: "Do you Wish to be Told the Number of Times that your Son/Daughter has Been Absent from Each Subject Class?"	11
XII	Responses of Parents to Item 12: "Do You Feel that the Computerized Comments are Sufficiently Detailed?"	11
XIII	Responses of School Staff to Item 1: "Has the Use of Computerized Report Cards Reduced the Amount of Time You Spend in the Production of Report Cards?"	13

Table		Page
XIV	Responses of School Staff to Item 2, "Have you Found that the Number of Errors on Report Cards has Decreased Under the Computerized System?"	14
XV	Responses of Administrators and Teachers to Item 3: "In Your Opinion, How do you Think the Number of Students that Receive Comments Under the Computerized System Compares with the Number Under the Manual System?"	14
XVI	Responses of Administrators and Teachers to Item 4: "In Your Opinion, How Does the Range of Comments Given to Students Compare Under the Two Systems?"	15
XVII	Responses of Administrators, Teachers, Counsellors and Committee Members to Item 5: "How Do You Feel About the Number of Computer-Printed Comments Produced per Course on the Report Card?"	16
XVIII	Responses of Administrators and Teachers to Item 6: "Under the Manual Reporting System Approximately What Percentage of Your Students Received More Than One Comment per Course?"	17
XIX	Responses of Administrators and Teachers to Item 7: "Under the Computerized Reporting System, Approximately What Percentage of Your Students Received Write-In Comments?	17
XX	Responses of School Staff to Item 8 Regarding the Extent of Value of Class Lists Produced Under the Computerized Report Card System	19
XXI	Responses of School Staff to Item 9 Regarding the Extent of Value of Biographical Information Produced Under the Computerized Report Card System	20
XXII	Responses of School Staff to Item 10 Regarding the Extent of Value of the Honor Roll Produced Under the Computerized Report Card System	21

Table		Page
XXIII	Responses of School Staff to Item 11 Regarding the Extent of Value of the Permanent Record Card Labels Produced Under the Computerized Report Card System	22
XXIV	Responses of School Staff to Item 12 Regarding the Extent of Value of the Marks Analysis Produced Under the Computerized Report Card System	23
XXV	Responses of School Staff to Item 13 Regarding the Extent of Value of the Address Labels Produced Under the Computerized Report Card System	24
XXVI	Responses of School Staff to Item 14 Regarding the Extent of Value of the Analysis of the Use of Comments Produced Under the Computerized Report Card System	25
XXVII	Responses of School Staff to Item 15 Regarding the Extent of Value of the Carbon Copies for Counsellors' Files and School Office Files Produced Under the Computerized Report Card System	26
XXVIII	Weighted Mean Scores Assigned by School Staff for Eight Items Produced Under the Computerized Report Card System	28
XXIX	Summary of Responses of Counsellors and Committee Members to Item 9: "How Useful are the Up-to-Date Listings of Courses Taken and Marks Received?".	30

EVALUATION OF COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS IN VANCOUVER SECONDARY SCHOOLS

ABSTRACT

Seven Vancouver secondary schools presently using computerized report cards participated in the study. Parents and school staff members (administrators, teachers, members of the computerized-report-card committee, counsellors, and clerical staff) were administered questionnaires regarding the computer-generated reports. The principal findings of the study were:

1) The majority of parents (77.4%) were generally satisfied with the computerized report card. This represented a substantial increase from the number reporting satisfaction in a previous study (53.4%).

2) Parents were most interested in learning about the academic progress and effort of their children, and least interested in their behaviour and social competence.

3) Most parents found the report card easy to read.

4) Parents were divided on the question of how to evaluate a student's progress, but the most popular choice was an evaluation of progress in terms of the student's own ability.

5) Parents favoured the existing system of using letter grades and teachers' comments by subject to indicate progress.

6) Report cards and report cards in conjunction with parent-teacher conferences were the preferred methods of reporting. The number of conferences held was considered sufficient

7) Parents liked having four reports a year and they appreciated being told about absenteeism from school or from subject classes.

8) A slight majority of parents felt that computerized comments were not sufficiently detailed.

9) Both parents (54.0%) and school staff (84.8%) wanted provision on the report card for two or more comments per course.

10) Computerized report cards saved time for the teachers and the clerical staff, but not for the committee members or counsellors.

11) The administrators were the only group that believed that errors had decreased under the computerized system.

12) Teachers and administrators believed that more students received comments under the computerized system than under the manual system, but that the range of comments was narrower, and the number of comments per course for each student was less with computerized report cards.

13) Staff members considered class lists the most beneficial product of the computerized report card system.

Modifications to the present system were proposed by the computer consultant of the Vancouver School Board to resolve the existing problems.

EVALUATION OF COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS IN VANCOUVER SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A. INTRODUCTION

During 1972, the Department of Planning and Evaluation conducted a study on current methods of reporting pupil progress.[1] The study included an evaluation of three different styles of report cards (one of which was computer-generated) being used in Vancouver secondary schools. The results of that evaluation have prompted further study of computer-generated report cards, with particular emphasis on their impact on parents and school staff.

Computerized report cards (see Appendix A) are an outgrowth of the VSB/ Honeywell Student Scheduling System.[2] During the final timetabling run in August, a computer record for each student, consisting of biographic and course information, is automatically created. In addition, subject section/marks gathering forms (SSMG's) are printed at this time. The SSMG's (see Appendix B) are initially used as class lists for each subject teacher. At mark reporting time, updated SSMG's are used to submit letter grades and other pertinent information to be included on the report cards.

For each reporting period, the computer may produce any or all of the following:

1) Report Cards

The report card (see Appendix A) is a three-part form: one for the student and his parents, with a detachable portion to be returned to the school; a copy for the office files; and a copy for the counsellor. The information presented is cumulative, i. e., all information for a report period will show in subsequent reporting periods. The report provides for a listing of courses and a print-out of letter grades, work habits, symbols and teachers' comments. Period absences, daily absences and tardies are also indicated.

2) Marks Analysis

Marks analyses by subject, by section, by grade, or by disability can be produced. A marks analysis by subject, for example, lists the number and percentage of students enrolled in a subject that received each letter grade.

---

[1] Gilbert, Katherine J. and E. N. Ellis, "An Evaluation of Current Methods to Report Pupil Progress", June 8, 1972, Research Report 72-08, Department of Planning and Evaluation, VSB.

[2] See VSB Research Report 73-05, "Computerized Scheduling in Vancouver Secondary Schools" by M. Lynne Durward.

3) Honour Roll

An honour roll may be produced at the end of each reporting period or may be based only on the final marks. For each grade, it lists the names and grade point averages of all those students who achieved a grade point average of 6 or better.

4) Program Specialty Report

This report lists the number of academic-program and non-academic-program students in grades 8 to 10. For grades 11 and 12, a full breakdown according to program specialty (e.g. commercial secretarial, commercial accountancy, etc.) is produced.

5) School Alphabetical Listing

This updated alphabetic list of all students is usually requested as part of the reporting period print-out.

6) Listing of Students with Specific Disabilities

Separate listings of students with specific disabilities can be produced if the school has made use of a special code for disabilities or alerts.[3]

7) Student Mailing Labels

These are gummed labels containing the student's name and address. They can be printed alphabetically by division or alphabetically by school.

8) Analysis of Comments

This report lists each comment code, the comment as it is printed on the report card, and the total number of times that comment was used by teachers.

9) Gummed Labels for Permanent Record Card and School's Record Card (Dead File)

These labels list the courses and grades of each student and relieve the clerical staff of transcribing information manually onto the record cards.

The above output of the computerized report card system is designed to reduce paperwork for teachers, produce a more legible report card, and provide analyses of school grading practices. However, the teacher is not freed from all clerical work--information must still be entered on forms to be submitted for keypunching.

---

[3]See W. Dodds, "How to Use VSB Computerized Report Cards System", Vancouver School Board, November, 1972.

There is no doubt that more legible report cards are produced, but some parents feel that "impersonality" is too high a price to pay for legibility. This view was substantiated by the results of the 1972 study on report cards.[4] (The school with computer report cards had the lowest percentage of parents satisfied with their report card: 53.4% as compared to 79.8% and 81.2% of parents in two schools with other methods of reporting). The most frequent comment cited about the computerized report card was that it was "too impersonal". The comments section of the report card was another source of complaint: the parents felt that the comments were too vague and too few in number. [A teacher is restricted to one comment per student for each course he teaches. The comments are generally chosen from a list of 98 comments (see Appendix C). The number of the comment is entered beside the student's name on the SSMG (see Appendix B) under "Comment Code" and the comment is printed out in full on the report card. Teachers in some schools write their personal ("write-in") comments on separate sheets of paper and include them with the student's report card.]

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect that the computer report card system has had on those people most intimately involved with them: parents and school personnel. Seven schools using computerized report cards participated in the study. For comparison's sake, some of the questions from the 1972 study regarding general reporting methods were repeated on the parent questionnaire. Several items specific to the computer report card were added. Parents were encouraged to comment on their overall reaction to the report cards.

The questionnaires sent to the school staff were aimed at answering several questions:

Did the use of computerized report cards actually save time?
Are there fewer errors with the computerized system?
How do the computerized comments compare with personal ones?
How beneficial are the items (e.g. class lists, honour roll, etc.) produced under the computerized system?
What are the advantages of the computerized report card system? What are the disadvantages?
What suggestions would you make to improve the system?

The school staff was divided into five categories (teachers, counsellors, committee members, clerical staff, administrators) in order to examine differences in attitude toward the computerized system that might be found among the groups.

---

[4] Gilbert, Katherine J. and E. N. Ellis, op. cit.

B. METHODOLOGY

In January, 1973, "Questionnaires to Parents of Students in Secondary Schools Using Computerized Report Cards" (see Appendix D) were sent to the seven schools participating in the study. The questionnaires were then included with the students' report cards to be sent home to parents. Approximately 11,700 questionnaires were distributed in this manner. A summary of the responses to the questionnaire is presented in Section C.

In February, 1973, questionnaires were sent to the following five groups of secondary school staff members:

a) administrators
b) teachers
c) counsellors
d) committee members
e) clerical staff

A summary of the responses to the questionnaires is presented in Section D. The responses of the five groups to identical items were compared.

C. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO PARENTS OF STUDENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS USING COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS

Questionnaires were sent with the report cards to the parents of students in seven secondary schools which were using computerized report cards. Of the 11,691 questionnaires sent out, 5,248 were completed, representing a 44.9% return. However, it is estimated that approximately 64% of the families with children enrolled in the schools were represented in the survey, based on the assumption that parents with more than one child at the school filled out only one questionnaire.

A summary of the responses to this questionnaire follows.

Item 1: Rank in order of interest the questions that you would like to have answered about the progress of your son or daughter in school.

How is my son/daughter progressing in his/her studies?
Is he/she working hard enough?
How does he/she behave in school?
Does he/she get along well with his/her fellow pupils?
Is my son/daughter happy in school?

Parents assigned numerical ranks to the questions and from these weighted-means were calculated. These weighted-mean priorities were then assigned numerical ranks. (See Table I)

TABLE I: WEIGHTED MEAN PRIORITIES AND NUMERICAL RANKS ASSIGNED BY PARENTS OF SECONDARY STUDENTS FOR FIVE QUESTIONS (ITEM 1)

Question	Weighted-Mean Priority	Numerical Rank
How is my son/daughter progressing in his/her studies?	1.56	1
Is he/she working hard enough?	2.59	2
How does he/she behave in school?	3.44	3
Does he/she get along well with his/her fellow pupils?	3.85	5
Is my son/daughter happy in school?	3.51	4

Parents generally assigned greater importance to academic progress and effort than to social competence and deportment. This finding is consistent with that of the previous report card study.[5]

Item 2: How do you find the report card?

Table II presents a summary of the responses to the second item.

TABLE II: RESPONSES OF PARENTS OF SEVEN SECONDARY SCHOOLS TO ITEM 2: "HOW DO YOU FIND THE REPORT CARD?"

Response	Number of Parents	Percentage
"Easy to read"	2,141	40.8%
"Fairly easy to read"	2,185	41.6%
"Fairly difficult to read"	693	13.2%
"Very difficult to read"	191	3.6%
No response	38	0.7%
Total	5,248	100.0%

[5]Gilbert, Katherine J. and E. N. Ellis, op. cit.

Most of the parents (82.4%) found the report card either easy or fairly easy to read. However, it was evident from a closer examination of the data that the schools where the first language of the majority of parents was not English had higher percentages of respondents who found the report card difficult to read. (At one such school, 23% of the parents had difficulty in reading the computerized report card).

Item 3: Which one of the following ways would you prefer for the evaluation of your son's/daughter's progress?

A summary of the responses to Item 3 is presented in Table III.

TABLE III: RESPONSES OF PARENTS OF SECONDARY STUDENTS TO ITEM 3

Response	Number of Parents	Percentage
1. Achievement in relation to his/her own ability	1,305	24.9%
2. A comparison with progress of other students	210	4.0%
3. A comparison with a prescribed standard of achievement	433	8.3%
4. A combination of 1 and 2	709	13.5%
5. A combination of 1 and 3	1,262	24.0%
6. A combination of 1, 2 and 3	1,197	22.8%
7. Other	76	1.4%
No response	56	1.1%
Total	5,248	100.0%

Parents were divided on the question of how to evaluate a student's progress, although a slightly larger percentage (24.9%) favoured an evaluation of progress in terms of the student's own ability. Another 24% wanted a combination of an evaluation of achievement in relation to ability and a comparison with a prescribed standard of achievement. Opinions were more clear cut in the 1972 report card study: over half (55.3%) of the parents indicated a preference for an evaluation of progress by achievement in relation to the student's ability.

Item 4: Which of the following reporting systems do you prefer for indicating progress?

The responses of the parents to Item 4 are presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV: RESPONSES OF PARENTS OF SECONDARY STUDENTS TO ITEM 4: "WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING REPORTING SYSTEMS DO YOU PREFER FOR INDICATING PROGRESS?"

Reporting System	Number of Parents	Percentage
1. Letter Grades, only	247	4.7%
2. Symbols, only	5	0.1%
3. Percentage Marks, only	114	2.2%
4. "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory"	94	1.8%
5. Teachers' Comments by Subject	284	5.4%
6. Symbols and Comments, only	104	2.0%
7. Letter Grades and Comments, only	2,480	47.3%
8. Percentage Marks and Comments	1,194	22.8%
9. Letter Grades and Percentage Marks	458	8.7%
10. Other	188	3.6%
No Response	80	1.5%
Total	5,248	100.0%

Almost half (47.3%) of the parents expressed a preference for letter grades and teachers' comments by subject, the scheme most like that presently in effect in their schools. "Percentage marks and comments" was cited by 1,194 parents (22.8%). In the "other" category, 84 parents indicated that they would like a combination of letter grades, percentage marks and comments.

Item 5: Which method of reporting do you like best?

Table V presents the responses of the parents to Item 5.

TABLE V: RESPONSES OF PARENTS OF SECONDARY STUDENTS TO ITEM 5: "WHICH METHOD OF REPORTING DO YOU LIKE BEST?"

Response	Number of Parents	Percentage
1. Report Cards	1,721	32.8%
2. Parent-teacher conferences	108	2.1%
3. A combination of these	1,664	31.7%
4. Conferences, only when requested	40	0.8%
5. Report cards and conferences only when requested	1,656	31.6%
6. Other	37	0.7%
No response	22	0.4%
Total	5,248	100.0%

Report cards are the most popular method of reporting: 96.1% of the parents preferred them, either alone or in combination with parent-teacher conferences.

Item 6: Re: the number of parent-teacher conferences

A summary of the parents' responses to Item 6 is presented in Table VI.

TABLE VI: RESPONSES OF PARENTS TO ITEM 6 REGARDING THE NUMBER OF PARENT-TEACHER CONFERENCES

Response	Number of Parents	Percentage
The number of parent-teacher conferences is sufficient	3,295	62.8%
More parent-teacher conferences are needed	1,518	28.9%
Fewer parent-teacher conferences are needed	245	4.7%
No response	190	3.6%
Total	5,248	100.0%

The majority of parents (62.8%) felt that the number of parent-teacher conferences was sufficient. However, 25 parents commented that they were not aware of the existence of such conferences.

Item 7: Re: the number of comments

Parents' responses to the item regarding the number of comments printed on the computerized report card are summarized in Table VII.

TABLE VII: SUMMARY OF PARENTS' RESPONSES TO ITEM 7 RE THE NUMBER OF COMPUTERIZED COMMENTS

Response	Number of Parents	Percentage
1. One teacher comment per course is sufficient	2,320	44.2%
2. There should be an allowance for two comments per course	1,251	23.8%
3. There should be an allowance for more than two comments per course	1,583	30.2%
No response	94	1.7%
Total	5,248	100.0%

The majority of the parents (54%) expressed the opinion that there should be more than the one comment per course presently allowed; 30.2% wanted more than two comments per course.

Item 8: How many times during the year would you like to have a report on your son's/daughter's progress in school?

Most of the parents (67.8%) favour the present practice of having four reports per year. (See Table VIII).

TABLE VIII: RESPONSES OF PARENTS TO ITEM 8: "HOW MANY TIMES DURING THE YEAR WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE A REPORT ON YOUR SON'S/DAUGHTER'S PROGRESS IN SCHOOL?

Number of Times	Number of Parents	Percentage
1	24	0.5%
2	236	4.5%
3	749	14.3%
4	3,556	67.8%
5	191	3.6%
6	168	3.2%
More than 6	71	1.3%
No response	253	4.8%
Total	5,248	100.0%

Item 9: In general, are you satisfied with the report card?

Generally, most of the parents were satisfied with the report card: 77.4% responded "yes" (see Table IX). This compares favourably with the results of the 1972 survey in which only 53.4% of the parents of students in the secondary school using computerized report cards were satisfied with the reports.

The fact that the questionnaire was sent with the student's report card may have led some parents to misinterpret the question as "Are you satisfied with the progress of your son/daughter as indicated on the report card?" A few parental comments such as "I am very pleased with John's report" supported this contention.

TABLE IX: RESPONSES OF PARENTS TO ITEM 9, "IN GENERAL, ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE REPORT CARD?"

Response	Number of Parents	Percentage
"Yes"	4,060	77.4%
"No"	1,114	21.2%
No response	74	1.4%
Total	5,248	100.0%

Item 10: Do you wish to be told the number of days that your son/daughter has been absent from school?

Almost 90% of the parents wished to be told of their child's absenteeism from school (see Table X). This information is included on the computerized report card.

TABLE X: RESPONSES OF PARENTS TO ITEM 10, "DO YOU WISH TO BE TOLD THE NUMBER OF DAYS THAT YOUR SON/DAUGHTER HAS BEEN ABSENT FROM SCHOOL?"

Response	Number of Parents	Percentage
"Yes"	4,694	89.4%
"No"	484	9.2%
No response	70	1.3%
Total	5,248	100.0%

Item 11: Do you wish to be told the number of times that your son/daughter has been absent from each subject class?

Parents were highly in favour of being told about class absenteeism: 83.6% responded "yes". (see Table XI). The computerized report card currently includes this information.

TABLE XI: RESPONSES OF PARENTS TO ITEM 11: "DO YOU WISH TO BE TOLD THE NUMBER OF TIMES THAT YOUR SON/DAUGHTER HAS BEEN ABSENT FROM EACH SUBJECT CLASS?"

Response	Number of Parents	Percentage
"Yes"	4,387	83.6%
"No"	787	15.0%
No response	74	1.4%
Total	5,248	100.0%

Item 12: Do you feel that the computerized comments are sufficiently detailed?

A slight majority of the parents (52.1%) felt that the comments were not sufficiently detailed; 46.0% agreed that they were. (see Table XII)

TABLE XII: RESPONSES OF PARENTS TO ITEM 12: "DO YOU FEEL THAT THE COMPUTERIZED COMMENTS ARE SUFFICIENTLY DETAILED?"

Response	Number of Parents	Percentage
"Yes"	2,415	46.0%
"No"	2,732	52.1%
No response	101	1.9%
Total	5,248	100.0%

Item 13: Please record any suggestions you would wish to make regarding the methods presently being used to report your child's progress in school.

Rather than merely listing suggestions, most of the 627 parents (11.9% of the total group) who responded to this item indicated their general feelings and/or complaints about the computerized report card system. The comments ranged from highly favourable ("the report card is excellent") to very derogatory ("computerized reporting is impersonal, inadequate, misleading, and inaccurate"). The most frequently cited comments are listed below:

Comments	Number of Parents	Percentage of Total Group
Re: computerized teachers' comments:		
"I would like more specific, personal comments"	96	1.8%
"Each subject teacher should comment"	36	0.7%
"There should be room enough for more than one comment"	25	0.5%
Re: computer report card errors:		
"Too many computer errors"	48	0.9%
"Attendance is inaccurate"	28	0.5%
Re: computerized report cards in general:		
"There should be a code for the course abbreviations"	35	0.7%
"The report card is too impersonal"	29	0.6%
"I am satisfied with the report card"	28	0.5%
"The report card is hard to read"	21	0.4%
Re: the grading system:		
"I would prefer percentage marks	38	0.7%

Eighty-four parents (1.6% of total group) wrote that they would like to be informed immediately of any problem that might arise concerning their children. They felt that to wait for the reporting period to inform parents was disastrous.

D. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES RE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS BY ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, COUNSELLORS, COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND CLERICAL STAFF

Questionnaires (see Appendices E, F, and G) were distributed to the staff members of seven secondary schools using computerized report cards. The questionnaires were aimed at five groups:

1) administrators,
2) teachers,
3) counsellors,
4) computer report card committee members, and
5) clerical staff.

The returns, by group, are summarized below:

	Administrators	Teachers	Counsellors	Committee Members	Clerical	Total
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=26)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=365)
No. Distributed	19	500	40	17	20	596
No. Returned	13	296	26	13	17	365
%age Returned	68.4%	59.2%	65.0%	76.5%	85.0%	61.2%

There was an overall percentage return of 61.2%, which represented 365 staff members.

Item 1: Has the use of computerized report cards reduced the amount of time you spend in the production of report cards?

The percentage of respondents in each group who answered "yes" to Item 1 ranged widely: from 15.4% of the committee members to 88.2% of the clerical staff. It is clear that computerized report cards do save time for the clerical staff and the teachers. The system has not, however, reduced the work load of the committee members ("no" - 76.9%) or the counsellors ("no" - 61.5%).

TABLE XIII: RESPONSES OF SCHOOL STAFF TO ITEM 1: "HAS THE USE OF COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS REDUCED THE AMOUNT OF TIME YOU SPEND IN THE PRODUCTION OF REPORT CARDS?"

Response	Administrators	Teachers	Counsellors	Committee Members	Clerical	Total
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=26)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=365)
"Yes"	53.8%	70.3%	30.8%	15.4%	88.2%	65.8%
"No"	46.2%	27.7%	61.5%	76.9%	5.9%	31.5%
No response	-	2.0%	7.7%	7.7%	5.9%	2.7%

Item 2: Have you found that the number of errors on report cards has decreased under the computerized system?

Most of the school staff (64.1%), including high percentages of both the counsellors (84.6%) and the clerical staff (76.5%), reported that the number of errors had not decreased under the computerized system. Only in the administrator group did a majority (53.8%) believe that the number of errors had decreased under the computerized system.

TABLE XIV: RESPONSES OF SCHOOL STAFF TO ITEM 2. "HAVE YOU FOUND THAT THE NUMBER OF ERRORS ON REPORT CARDS HAS DECREASED UNDER THE COMPUTERIZED REPORT SYSTEM?"

Response	Administrators	Teachers	Counsellors	Committee Members	Clerical Staff	Total
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=26)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=365)
"Yes"	53.8%	28.0%	11.5%	30.8%	17.6%	27.4%
"No"	46.2%	62.8%	84.6%	53.8%	76.5%	64.1%
No response	-	9.1%	3.8%	15.4%	5.9%	8.5%

Item 3: In your opinion, how do you think the number of students that receive comments under the computerized system compares with the number under the manual system? (Directed to administrators and teachers only)

In general, both administrators and teachers thought that more students received comments under the computerized system; however, the percentage of administrators that held this view (84.6%) was considerably higher than that of the teachers (49.7%).

TABLE XV: RESPONSES OF ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS TO ITEM 3: "IN YOUR OPINION, HOW DO YOU THINK THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS THAT RECEIVE COMMENTS UNDER THE COMPUTERIZED SYSTEM COMPARES WITH THE NUMBER UNDER THE MANUAL SYSTEM?"

Response	Administrators	Teachers	Total
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=309)
"More students receive comments under the computerized system"	84.6%	49.7%	51.1%
"Fewer students receive comments under the computerized system"	7.7%	16.6%	16.2%
"About the same number of students receive comments under the two systems"	7.7%	32.4%	31.4%
No response	-	1.4%	1.3%

Item 4: In your opinion, how does the range of comments given to students compare under the two systems? (Directed to administrators and teachers only)

The greatest percentage of the administrators (46.2%) believed that a wider range of comments was used under the computerized system. The teachers disagreed: 62.8% believed that a narrower range of comments was used with computerized report cards. (See Table XVI)

TABLE XVI: RESPONSES OF ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS TO ITEM 4: "IN YOUR OPINION, HOW DOES THE RANGE OF COMMENTS GIVEN TO STUDENTS COMPARE UNDER THE TWO SYSTEMS?"

Response	Administrators (N=13)	Teachers (N=296)	Total (N=309)
"A wider range of comments is used under the computerized system"	46.2%	22.3%	23.3%
"A narrower range of comments is used under the computerized system"	38.5%	62.8%	61.8%
"The range of comments is about the same under both systems"	15.4%	13.9%	13.9%
No response	-	1.0%	1.0%

Item 5: How do you feel about the number of computer-printed comments produced per course on the report card? (Directed to all but clerical staff)

The consensus of opinion was that there should be an allowance for more than the one comment presently allowed: 84.8% of the total number of respondents wanted two or more comments, while only 14.7% thought that one comment was sufficient. It is interesting to note that of those who did favour the use of only one comment, the teacher group (the group directly responsible for choosing comments for the report cards) had the highest percentage (15.5%).

TABLE XVII: RESPONSES OF ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, COUNSELLORS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO ITEM 5: "HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE NUMBER OF COMPUTER-PRINTED COMMENTS PRODUCED PER COURSE ON THE REPORT CARD?"

Response	Administrators (N=13)	Teachers (N=296)	Counsellors (N=26)	Committee Member (N=13)	Total (N=348)
"One comment per course is sufficient"	7.7%	15.5%	11.5%	7.7%	14.7%
"There should be an allowance for two comments per course"	76.9%	50.3%	46.2%	76.9%	52.0%
"There should be an allowance for three or more comments per course"	15.4%	34.1%	38.5%	15.4%	32.8%
No response	-	-	3.8%	-	0.6%

Item 6: Under the manual reporting system, approximately what percentage of your students received more than one comment per course. (Directed to administrators and teachers only)

Of the teachers and administrators combined, the largest percentage (32.4%) estimated that 0 - 25% of their students received more than one comment per course under the manual system. Another 31.4% estimated that 25-50% received more than one comment. (see Table XVIII)

TABLE XVIII: RESPONSES OF ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS TO ITEM 6: "UNDER THE MANUAL REPORTING SYSTEM APPROXIMATELY WHAT PERCENTAGE OF YOUR STUDENTS RECEIVED MORE THAN ONE COMMENT PER COURSE?"

Response	Administrators	Teachers	Total
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=309)
"Over 75%"	15.4%	7.4%	7.8%
"50-75%"	15.4%	19.6%	19.4%
"25-50%"	15.4%	32.1%	31.4%
"0-25%"	38.5%	32.1%	32.4%
No response	15.4%	8.8%	9.1%

Item 7: Under the computerized reporting system, approximately what percentage of your students received write-in comments?

According to most of the administrators and teachers, 10% or fewer of the students receive write-in comments, i.e. personal comments which are written on a separate piece of paper and enclosed with the report card. (See Table X1X.

TABLE XIX: RESPONSES OF ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS TO ITEM 7: "UNDER THE COMPUTERIZED REPORTING SYSTEM, APPROXIMATELY WHAT PERCENTAGE OF YOUR STUDENTS RECEIVED WRITE-IN COMMENTS?

Response	Administrators	Teachers	Total
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=309)
"Over 50%"	7.7%	7.8%	7.8%
"30-50%"	-	6.1%	5.8%
"10-30%"	23.1%	8.1%	8.7%
" 0-10%"	61.5%	75.3%	74.8%
No response	7.7%	2.7%	2.9%

Item 8: Listed below are eight items produced under the computerized report card system. For each item, indicate the extent of its value to you in terms of usefulness and amount of time saved.

Class lists
Biographical information
Honour roll
Permanent record card labels
Marks analysis
Address labels
Analysis of the use of comments
Carbon copies for counsellors' files and school office file

Summaries of the responses of all the staff members for the eight items are presented in Tables XX to XXVII.

TABLE XX: RESPONSES OF SCHOOL STAFF TO ITEM 8 REGARDING THE EXTENT OF VALUE OF CLASS LISTS PRODUCED UNDER THE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARD SYSTEM

Class Lists

Response	Administrators (N=13)	Teachers (N=296)	Counsellors (N=26)	Committee Members (N=13)	Clerical (N=17)	Total Group (N=365)
"Extremely beneficial"	61.5%	34.5%	42.3%	53.8%	58.8%	37.8%
"Beneficial"	30.8%	47.9%	34.6%	38.5%	29.4%	45.2%
"Of little value"	-	10.8%	7.7%	-	-	9.3%
"Of no value to me"	-	4.1%	11.5%	7.1	-	4.4%
"Has not been produced at our school"	7.7%	1.0%	-	-	5.9%	1.4%
"No response"	-	1.7%	3.8%	-	5.9%	1.9%

TABLE XXI: RESPONSES OF SCHOOL STAFF TO ITEM 9 REGARDING THE EXTENT OF VALUE OF BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION PRODUCED UNDER THE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARD SYSTEM

Responses	Administrators	Teachers	Counsellors	Committee Members	Clerical	Total Group
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=26)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=365)
"Extremely beneficial"	46.2%	7.4%	26.9%	61.5%	35.3%	13.4%
"Beneficial"	38.5%	31.4%	50.0%	30.8%	47.1%	33.7%
"Of little value"	7.7%	26.6%	15.4%	-	5.9%	20.8%
"Of no value to me"	-	16.9%	7.7%	7.7%	-	14.5%
"Has not been produced at our school"	7.7%	13.2%	-	-	-	11.0%
"No response"	-	7.4%	-	-	11.8%	6.6%

TABLE XXII: RESPONSES OF SCHOOL STAFF TO ITEM 10 REGARDING THE EXTENT OF VALUE OF THE HONOR ROLL PRODUCED UNDER THE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARD SYSTEM

Response	Administrators	Teachers	Counsellors	Committee Members	Clerical	Total Group
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=26)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=365)
"Extremely beneficial	61.5%	4.1%	23.1%	23.1%	17.6%	8.8%
"Beneficial"	38.5%	27.4%	46.2%	61.5%	29.4%	30.4%
"Of little value"	-	22.3%	11.5%	-	17.6%	19.7%
"Of no value to me"	-	18.9%	7.7%	1 .4%	23.5%	17.5%
"Has not been produced at our school"	-	17.2%	11.5%	-	5.9%	15.1%
"No response"	-	10.1%	-	-	5.9%	8.5%

TABLE XXIII: RESPONSES OF SCHOOL STAFF TO ITEM 11 REGARDING THE EXTENT OF VALUE OF THE PERMANENT RECORD CARD LABELS PRODUCED UNDER THE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARD SYSTEM

Response	Administrators	Teachers	Counsellors	Committee Members	Clerical	Total Group
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=26)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=365)
"Extremely beneficial"	76.9%	10.8%	34.6%	69.2%	76.5%	20.0%
"Beneficial"	15.4%	21.6%	42.3%	15.4%	17.6%	22.5%
"Of little value"	-	8.4%	-	-	-	6.8%
"Of no value to me"	7.7%	35.5%	11.5%	15.4%	-	30.4%
"Has not been produced at our school"	-	10.5%	11.5%	-	-	9.3%
"No response"	-	13.2%	-	-	5.9%	11.0%

TABLE XXIV: RESPONSES OF SCHOOL STAFF TO ITEM 12 REGARDING THE EXTENT OF VALUE OF THE MARKS ANALYSIS PRODUCED UNDER THE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARD SYSTEM

Response	Administrators	Teachers	Counsellors	Committee Members	Clerical	Total Group
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=26)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=365)
"Extremely beneficial"	69.2%	5.7%	23.1%	38.5%	5.9%	10.4%
"Beneficial"	30.8%	34.5%	26.9%	46.2%	5.9%	32.9%
"Of little value"	-	15.2%	11.5%	-	5.9%	13.4%
"Of no value to me"	-	17.2%	11.5%	15.4%	70.6%	18.6%
"Has not been produced at our school"	-	15.9%	26.9%	-	5.9%	15.1%
"No response"	-	11.5%	-	-	5.9%	9.6%

TABLE XXV: RESPONSES OF SCHOOL STAFF TO ITEM 13 REGARDING THE EXTENT OF VALUE OF THE ADDRESS LABELS PRODUCED UNDER THE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARD SYSTEM

Response	Administrators	Teachers	Counsellors	Committee Members	Clerical	Total Group
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=26)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=365)
"Extremely beneficial"	30.8%	8.1%	11.5%	23.1%	35.3%	11.0%
"Beneficial"	23.1%	20.3%	34.6%	15.4%	11.8%	20.8%
"Of little value"	15.4%	9.1%	11.5%	-	17.6%	9.6%
"Of no value to me"	15.4%	31.4%	30.8%	30.8%	5.9%	29.6%
"Has not been produced at our school"	15.4%	17.9%	7.7%	30.8%	23.5%	17.8%
"No response"	-	13.2%	3.8%	-	5.9%	11.2%

TABLE XXVI: RESPONSES OF SCHOOL STAFF TO ITEM 14 REGARDING THE EXTENT OF VALUE OF THE ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF COMMENTS PRODUCED UNDER THE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARD SYSTEM

Response	Administrators	Teachers	Counsellors	Committee Members	Clerical	Total Group
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=26)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=365)
"Extremely beneficial"	30.8%	2.4%	11.5%	-	-	3.8%
"Beneficial"	30.8%	19.9%	30.8%	69.2%	5.9%	21.9%
"Of little value"	15.4%	15.5%	15.4%	15.4%	5.9%	15.1%
"Of no value to me"	-	22.3%	19.2%	15.4%	82.4%	23.8%
"Has not been produced at our school"	23.1%	22.6%	23.1%	-	-	20.8%
"No response"	-	17.2%	-	-	5.9%	14.5%

TABLE XXVII: RESPONSES OF SCHOOL STAFF TO ITEM 15 REGARDING THE EXTENT OF VALUE OF THE CARBON COPIES FOR COUNSELLORS' FILES AND SCHOOL OFFICE FILES PRODUCED UNDER THE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARD SYSTEM

Response	Administrators	Teachers	Counsellors	Committee Members	Clerical	Total Group
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=26)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=365)
"Extremely beneficial"	69.2%	14.2%	65.4%	61.5%	64.7%	23.8%
"Beneficial"	23.1%	28.7%	23.1%	23.1%	23.5%	27.7%
"Of little value"	-	6.4%	3.8%	-	5.9%	5.8%
"Of no value to me"	7.7%	35.5%	3.8%	15.4%	-	29.9%
"Has not been produced at our school"	-	1.7%	3.8%	-	-	1.6%
"No response"	-	13.5%	-	-	5.9%	11.2%

Table XXVIII presents the weighted means assigned by the school staff for the items produced by the computerized report card system. In order to calculate these scores values were assigned to the possible responses:

"extremely beneficial" - 1
"beneficial" - 2
"of little value" - 3
"of no value to me" - 4

The lower the weighted mean, the more beneficial the item.

TABLE XXVIII: WEIGHTED MEAN SCORES ASSIGNED BY SCHOOL STAFF FOR EIGHT ITEMS PRODUCED UNDER THE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARD SYSTEM

	Administrators	Teachers	Counsellors	Committee Members	Clerical	Total Group
	(N=13)	(N=296)	(N=26)	(N=13)	(N=17)	(N=365)
"Class lists"	1.33	1.84	1.88	1.62	1.33	1.80
"Biographical Information	1.58	2.63	2.04	1.54	1.67	2.44
"Honour roll"	1.38	2.77	2.04	2.08	2.53	2.60
"Permanent record card labels"	1.38	2.90	1.87	1.62	1.19	2.60
"Marks analysis"	1.31	2.60	2.16	1.92	3.60	2.53
"Address labels"	2.18	2.93	2.70	2.56	1.92	2.81
"Analysis of the use of comments"	1.80	2.97	2.55	2.46	3.81	2.91
"Carbon copies for counsellors' files and school office file"	1.46	2.75	1.44	1.69	1.38	2.48

"Class lists" had the lowest weighted mean for the total group (1.80) and were thus of most value to the group as a whole. A majority of the administrators (61.5%), committee members (53.8%) and clerical staff (58.8%) considered class lists "extremely beneficial".

Biographical information was deemed beneficial by the majority in all groups, except the teachers, of whom only 38.8% considered it valuable.

The administrators were unanimous in their opinion of the honour roll - 100% rated it as either "beneficial" or "extremely beneficial".

Permanent record card labels were most valuable to the clerical staff (weighted mean of 1.19).

Principals rated the marks analysis as the item most beneficial to them (weighted mean = 1.31). The response of the committee members toward the marks analysis was also favourable (weighted mean = 1.92).

Address labels, understandably, had little value except for the clerical staff (weighted mean = 1.92).

The analysis of the use of comments, in terms of the total group, was the item of least value: only 25.7% of the staff scored it as beneficial or better. Of the five groups, the analysis was of most benefit to the administrators (weighted mean score = 1.80).

Administrators, counsellors, committee members and clerical staff (weighted means of 1.46, 1.44, 1.69 and 1.38 respectively) concurred that the carbon copies for counsellor's files and school office files were beneficial; the teachers, however, found them of little value (weighted mean = 2.75).

In general, the administrators group was the most enthusiastic about the benefits of the computerized report card system, and they valued the marks analysis most highly. (The analysis of marks is a purely administrative function). The other groups also favoured those items of particular value to them in their specific capacities: teachers favoured class lists; counsellors appreciated their own copies of students' marks; and the clerical staff valued the permanent record card labels and class lists, which they previously had to produce manually.

Item 9: Master Revision Cards are produced in the spring to enable students to choose courses for the following year. How useful are the up-to-date listings of courses taken and marks received? (For counsellors and committee members only)

Both counsellors and committee members found the up-to-date listings useful (see Table XXIX). Over half (53.8%) of the committee members rated the listings "extremely useful".

TABLE XXIX: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES OF COUNSELLORS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO ITEM 9: "HOW USEFUL ARE THE UP-TO-DATE LISTINGS OF COURSES TAKEN AND MARKS RECEIVED?"

Response	Counsellors	Committee Members	Total
	(N=26)	(N=13)	(N=39)
Extremely useful	34.6%	53.8%	41.0%
Useful	34.6%	30.8%	33.3%
Not very useful	19.2%	7.7%	15.4%
Not useful at all	7.7%	7.7%	7.7%
No response	3.8%	-	2.6%

Item 10: In your present position, what do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of computerized report cards? What suggestions do you have for improvement?

The most commonly cited advantages, disadvantages and suggestions are listed below:

Advantages	Number of Respondents	% of Total Group (N=365)
"Saves time overall"	98	26.8%
"Multiple copies of report cards"	24	6.6%
"Neat, professional, legible"	22	6.0%
"Accuracy"	13	3.6%
"More comments"	10	2.7%
"Less forgery by students"	9	2.5%

Clerical staff especially appreciated the legibility of the computerized report cards and permanent record cards. Counsellors liked having a "cumulative report on absences and marks for easy reference".

Disadvantages

	Number of Respondents	% of Total Group (N=365)
"Comments are too general, imprecise, and limited in number"	99	27.1%
"The report card is too impersonal"	70	19.2%
"The slowness of the system requires that teachers submit marks several weeks before the end of the term. Thus the last weeks are wasted for teaching since the students are indifferent."	51	14.0%
"Too many errors and inaccuracies" ("The student tells his parents that his poor grades are computer errors.")	29	7.9%
"The report is visually confusing, crowded, difficult for parents to understand"	25	6.8%
"It requires too much work to make changes"	17	4.7%

Two teachers did not appreciate the computer's help: they claimed that, with the loss of the task of transcribing marks, they had lost personal contact with their homeroom classes.

Suggestions

	Number of Respondents	% of Total Group (N=365)
"Allow for personal comments"	62	17.0%
"Provide a wider range of comments"	28	7.7%
"Provide room for more comments"	28	7.7%
"Abolish computer report cards; revert to old method"	23	6.3%
"Speed up the system to shorten turn-around time"	13	3.6%
"Include a code for the course abbreviations"	11	3.0%

E. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

In the present study, parents reacted to the reporting procedures in much the same way as they did in 1972. They were most interested in the academic progress and effort of their children. Most parents wanted to receive four report cards per year, and wished to be told both the number of days their children had been absent from school and the number of times they had been absent from each subject class.

The results of the present study did, however, differ in two respects. This year, 77.4% of the parents indicated that they were satisfied with the report card; last year only 53.4% of the parents with students in the school with computerized report cards expressed satisfaction. Many factors may account for this discrepancy, one of them being differences in sample size (the 1972 study had 60 respondents, the 1973 study 5,248 respondents), but the fact that the percentage of satisfied parents in the school surveyed in the 1972 study rose from 53.4% to 71.3% in 1973 would indicate that in general the parents' attitude toward computerized report cards has become more positive. Secondly, 47.3% of the parents in the present study preferred a combination of letter grades and comments for indicating progress, compared with only 5.0% last year. (The combination of letter grades and comments is used on the computerized report card.)

It would appear that the computerized report card in general, and its method of indicating progress in particular, are gaining wider acceptance from the parents.

The computerized report card was most severely criticized by parents in regard to the comments section. The majority of parents (54.0% of the 5,248 respondents) thought that two or more comments should be allowed; 52.1% thought that the comments were not sufficiently detailed.

Approximately 12% of the parents submitted additional suggestions or criticisms. Again the comments section of the report card was heavily attacked: the parents wanted more specific, personal comments, room for more than one comment per course, and comments from every subject teacher. The number of computer errors and the general impersonality of the report card were other sources of complaint. Several parents also suggested that a code for course abbreviations be included on the report card. (Note, however, that the percentages of the total number of parents issuing these complaints were small - see Section C, Item 13.)

The views of the school staff concurred with those of the parents, particularly in regard to the number of errors and the inadequacy of the comments. Most of the staff (84.8%) wanted an allowance for two or more comments (32.8% wanted three or more), and a majority (64.1%) thought that errors had not decreased with the new system. (The administrators, who revealed a pro-computer attitude throughout the questionnaire, were a notable exception here: 53.8% thought that errors had decreased.) Some

of the staff also noted that the comments were too general and imprecise, and that the report card, in general, was "too impersonal".

Both teachers and administrators agreed that more comments were given under the computerized system, but they disagreed as to the range of the comments: principals believed that the range was wider with the computer, teachers believed it was narrower.

Although more students received at least one comment per course under the computer system, the occurrence of two or more comments per course per student was more frequent with manual systems of grade reporting. About one-quarter of the teachers claimed that over half of their students received two or more comments under the manual system; under the computerized system, only 8% of the teachers claimed to give more than half of their students two or more comments (through the use of hand-written comments). A few teachers noted that they had encountered difficulties with their school's internal method of inserting hand-written comments. These difficulties may have discouraged some teachers from adding comments.

Advocates of the computerized report card system hail it as a time saver. The present study found that it did save time for teachers and clerical staff, but not for counsellors and committee members. The administrators were divided on this question.

Class lists were considered the most beneficial product of the computerized system by staff members. The administrators rated five of the eight products of the system as "extremely beneficial" (class lists, honour roll, permanent record cards, marks analysis, carbon copies); the teachers rated none as "extremely beneficial", but did acknowledge the usefulness of the class lists. Class lists, permanent record cards and carbon copies were enthusiastically endorsed by the clerical staff.

Fifty-one (14%) of the staff expressed their annoyance about the time lag that existed between the date when the marks had to be submitted for keypunching and the termination of the school term. It was their contention that as soon as the students knew that their marks would not be changed, class interest and attention dwindled. The teachers and administrators in particular advocated a faster turn-around to shorten the time lag.

F. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS OF THE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARD SYSTEM

It is evident from the findings of this study that the computerized report card system, while generally acceptable to parents and school staff, has several drawbacks which are disappointing to some parents and teachers. The "computer errors", the inadequate comments, and the time lags have been common objects of criticism.

Mr. Wayne Dodds, computer consultant for the Vancouver School Board, is acutely aware of these problems and has recently proposed

several improvements to the system to solve the difficulties. The purpose of these modifications, according to Mr. Dodds, is three-fold:

- to relieve the school staff of mundane tasks so that the extra time might be utilized for further interaction with students;
- to provide better feedback to the school staff to enable them to detect individual student problems before they become too serious; and
- to improve the report card so that it gives parents additional insight into the achievement and difficulties of their children in school.

Some of the proposed modifications are listed below:

(1) Improvement of quality and quantity of comments

With the introduction of proposed changes, the comments section of the computerized report card would closely approximate an anecdotal report. This would be accomplished:

a) by allowing teachers to submit up to four computer-produced comments per course,

b) by increasing substantially the selection of comments available to teachers (from 99 to 400), and

c) by introducing a set of comments for each subject area (e.g., English, history, physical education) which is specific to the student's performance in that area.

d) by allowing each school to author (and modify at any time) its own complete set of 400 comments, which would be specific to its own curricula, student body, and taste. (At present, all schools must use an identical set of 98 comments available to the whole district).

(2) Elimination of course abbreviations

Currently courses are identified on the report card by six-character abbreviations. It is proposed that these abbreviations be replaced by course names spelled out in full (to a maximum of twelve to fourteen characters).

(3) Elimination of most maintenance procedures

The majority of counsellors and committee members reported that their work had not decreased under the computerized system. This is not surprising: it is these two groups that are responsible for the up-dating and other time consuming maintenance work necessary under the present system. Whenever a student moves, or changes a course mid-year, for example, a counsellor or committee member must fill out the proper forms and have the data keypunched before submitting them to the computer for updating of school records. Under the proposed modified system, the computer would handle such maintenance automatically. For example, if, at mark-reporting time, a teacher did not submit any information about a student previously registered in his class, the report card would not list that course as being taken by the student, but, in the event that the student had transferred to another course, and the second teacher had submitted a mark for him. both the course name and the mark would appear on the report card. Thus, updating could be achieved without the counsellors and committee members having to fill out a number of transfer forms and with no additional burden being imposed on teachers.

However, those courses which had received a final mark (e. g. one-semester courses), or which had been specially "flagged" on the school timetable file, would remain on the student's record whether or not any further marks were submitted for that student and for that course. Furthermore, the same method of input could be used to change (correct) a student's marks for a previous report card.

After the report cards were printed, the computer would print up revised class lists which would show all the marks on file for each student. This would allow the teacher to check for errors in marks. (It is not easy to check for such errors under the present system).

(4) Reduction of time lag and elimination of keypunching

Part of the reason for the present time lag is the need for keypunching. All student marks, comments, etc., must be keypunched before they can be processed by the computer. Also, all updates and changes to the student record must be keypunched. With the introduction of an optic mark card reader, much of this keypunching would be eliminated. Teachers could insert their marks, comment codes, etc., on the optic mark cards and send them directly to be processed by the computer. The advantages of this system are obvious: it eliminates the high cost of keypunching, it reduces the turn-around time (the time lag between the teacher's submission of marks and the final production of report cards), and it eliminates possible keypunch errors.

Further reduction of the present time lag would occur by decollating and bursting the report cards at the school, rather than at the computer centre as at present.

These savings of time could mean that marks which had been put on the optic mark cards could be submitted one day, the cards printed overnight, and the final product returned to the school the next day.

(5) Production of additional information useful to administrators and counsellors

Some of the additional output that have been proposed are:

(a) a list, for counsellors, of all students whose letter grades have dropped or changed significantly. Such a list would alert counsellors not only to the student with chronic problems, but also to the average student who, for example, might have dropped from a "B" to a "C".

(b) "failure lists", by subject area, of all students who failed a subject in the previous year. It has been possible for a student to "promote himself", e.g., to show up in the fall for a Mathematics 12 class when he had failed Mathematics 11 the previous year. Such students might go undetected but they would likely have little chance of success, causing an unfortunate strain on the classroom learning environment. "Failure lists" would alert teachers to guard against such intruders.

(c) preliminary lists of the number of students who have failed each course. These lists are required to be sent to Victoria in the late spring and are now prepared manually.

The modifications proposed by Mr. Dodds would correct or improve those aspects of the computerized report card system that have been criticized by parents and school staff.

PLEASE DETACH

HAVE YOUR SON/DAUGHTER RETURN THIS PORTION TO THE SCHOOL WITHIN TWO DAYS. NO RETURN IS NECESSARY ON THE JUNE REPORT.

STUDENT NO.	GRADE	DIVISION	RPT. PD.

HOME ROOM TEACHER	COUNSELLOR

TO THE PARENTS/GUARDIANS OF

PLEASE COMPLETE:

AVERAGE HOURS HOME STUDY/SCHOOL DAY _____

CHECK IF INTERVIEW DESIRED ☐

_____

PARENT / GUARDIAN SIGNATURE

TEAR HERE

REPORT TO PARENTS

STUDENT NO.	SURNAME	FIRST	INIT	GRADE DIV.	HOME RO

SCHOOL

COUNSELLOR

COURSE No.			ONE			TWO			THREE			FOUR			FINAL		TEACHER
COURSE	SECT	SEM	LG	WH	Pd Ab	LG	WH	Pd Ab	LG	WH	Pd Ab	LG	WH	Pd Ab	Pd LG	Pd Ab	
ABSENCE																	
TARDY																	

LG - LETTER GRADE SYMBOLS

A	EXCELLENT	I	INCOMPLETE
B	GOOD	P	PASS
C+, C, C-	AVERAGE	F	FAILURE
		W	WITHDRAWN
		DC	MINIMAL PASS GRANTED - DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR ADVANCED
D	POOR		ELECTIVE IN THIS
E	FAILING		SUBJECT

WH - WORK HABIT SYMBOLS

G — GOOD
N — NORMAL
U — UNSATISFACTORY
PD AB — PERIODS ABSENT
SEMESTER 1 - 1 ONLY
SEMESTER 2 - 2 ONLY
SEMESTER 3 - ALL

APPROVED FOR USE IN THE SCHOOLS OF SCHOOL DIST. NO. 39 (VANCOUVER) BY THE BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES.

(THIS IS NOT AN

REPORT TO PARENTS

SCHOOL DISTRICT 39
VANCOUVER, B.C.

STUDENT NO.	SURNAME	FIRST	INIT	GRADE DIV.	HOME ROOM TEACHER	SPECIALTY

SCHOOL		COUNSELLOR		PROGRAM	

COURSE No.			ONE			TWO			THREE			FOUR			FINAL		TEACHER	COMMENTS
COURSE	SECT	S E M	L G	W H	Pd Ab	L G	W H	Pd Ab	L G	W H	Pd Ab	L G	W H	Pd Ab	LG	Pd Ab		
ABSENCE																		
TARDY																		

TEAR HERE

APPENDIX A

PROMOTION COMMENT (FINAL REPORT ONLY)

LG - LETTER GRADE SYMBOLS

A	EXCELLENT	I	INCOMPLETE
B	GOOD	P	PASS
		F	FAILURE
C+	AVERAGE	W	WITHDRAWN
C		DC	MINIMAL PASS GRANTED - DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR ADVANCED ELECTIVE IN THIS SUBJECT
C-			
D	POOR		
E	FAILING		

WH - WORK HABIT SYMBOLS

G — GOOD
N — NORMAL
U — UNSATISFACTORY
PD AB — PERIODS ABSENT
SEMESTER 1 - 1 ONLY
SEMESTER 2 - 2 ONLY
SEMESTER 3 - ALL

APPROVED FOR USE IN THE SCHOOLS OF SCHOOL DIST. NO. 39 (VANCOUVER) BY THE BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES.

RETAIN THIS COPY

(THIS IS NOT AN OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF CREDITS)

SUBJECT SECTION/MARKS GATHERING FORM

SCHOOL NAME	DAY	MO.	YR.

COURSE NO.	DESCRIPTION	SECTION	SEM'R	BLK	TEACHER

ROOMS

PROGRAM
A - ACADEMIC
N - NON-ACADEMIC
I - INDUSTRIAL
C - COMMERCIAL
V - VOCATIONAL
S - COMM. SERVICE
U - VISUAL PERFORMING ARTS
O - OCCUPATIONAL

SPECIALTY
H - ARTS
T - TECHNICAL
S - SCIENCE
B - SECRETARIAL
D - ACCOUNTING
C - CLERICAL
G - ART
P - MUSIC

SPECIALTY
W - CONSTRUCTION
M - MECHANICS
E - ELECTRONICS
V - VISUAL COMMUNICATION
F - FOODS
L - TEXTILES
K - HOME IND. SERVICES

ALERTS
L - LANGUAGE
S - SPEECH
V - VISION
H - HEARING
M - MEDICAL
C - COUNSELLOR

SEMESTER
1 - 1ST 2 - 2ND 3 - BOTH

ABILITY: LOW = HIGH 1 = 7
READING 1 = 9
MARK POINT AVERAGE (M.P.A.) 1 = 7

PAGE

STUDENT NUMBER	SURNAME	FIRST NAME	INIT	SEX	DIV.	REPORT MARKS L.G.	W.H.	COMMENT CODE	LINE	CORRECTIONS L.G.	W.H.	COMMENT CODE	BIRTH DATE DAY	MO.	YR.	PROG	SPEC	ABIL	READ	MPA	ALERTS

APPENDIX B

38

SPERIDELO MOORE BUSINESS FORMS LTD.

APPENDIX C

NUMERIC CODES FOR COMMENTS, COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS

** Choose one comment at most for each student you teach, for each course.
** The comments vary from complimentary to critical, reading down the page.

N.B. HEADINGS IN BOXES DO NOT APPEAR ON REPORT CARDS.

ACHIEVEMENT (GENERAL)

01. Doing excellent work.

03. Superior progress.
04. Very good work

06. Satisfactory progress.
07. Good work--needs constant review.

09. Improving in this course.
10. Trying, but below Grade standard.

12. Lacks knowledge of basic concepts.
13. Trying but course seems too hard.

15. Unsatisfactory progress.
16. No improvement shown.

WORK HABITS & BEHAVIOUR

18. Shows great enthusiasm.
19. Shows initiative and responsibility.
20. Conscientious, cooperative student.

22. Works well independently.
23. Does not work well independently.

25. Capable of better work.
26. Does not work to level of ability.
27. Work is deteriorating.
28. Does not take active part in class.
29. Study habits need improving.
30. More concentration in class needed.
31. Must follow instructions carefully.
32. Lack of effort in participation.
33. Behaviour needs improving.
34. Poor attitude affecting standing.
35. Attitude toward safety must improve.
36. Careless and indifferent.

38. Too frequently tardy.
39. Poor attendance affecting standing.
40. Poor attendance may cause failure.
41. Little work done. . . failure possible.

ADVICE

43. Can improve with greater effort.
44. Extra practice needed.
45. Extra help available for the asking.
46. Extra lab time is available.
47. Daily home study required.
48. Contact teacher through counsellors.
49. Recommendation might be withheld.
50. Summer school advised.
51. Summer school not advised.
52. Change of program may be advisable.
53. Further courses not advised in area.

ACHIEVEMENT (SPECIFIC)

54. Excellent fitness.
55. Written assignments excellent.
56. Work in seminars excellent.
57. Skills are excellent.
58. Contributes well to discussions.
59. Good oral participation.
60. Tries but fitness needs improvement.
61. Written work needs improvement.
62. Oral work needs improvement.
63. Essay work very weak.
64. Does not use touch method.
65. Techniques need improving.
66. Faulty technique.
67. Speech below required standard.
68. Does not proof read work accurately.
69. Low fitness performance.

PROJECTS & ACTIVITIES

70. Project(s) well done.
71. Extra-curricular help appreciated.
72. Does not share in care of equipment.
73. Equipment not brought regularly.
74. Notebook incomplete.
75. Assignments incomplete.
76. Lab reports incomplete.
77. Not following proper lab procedures.

PROJECTS & ACTIVITIES (Continued)

78. Relies on lab partner too much.
79. Laboratory reports unsatisfactory.
80. Utilizes lab time inefficiently.

EXPLANATIONS

81. See further report for this course.
82. Language problem a factor in mark.
83. Medical excuse.
84. Estimated mark.

86. New arrival - no mark at this time.
87. Letter grade withheld.
88. Auditing course. . . no grade given.
89. Non-credit course. . . enrichment.
90. Non-credit course. . . remedial.
91. Notebook not handed in.
92. Assignments not completed regularly.
93. Lab reports not submitted.
94. Work not submitted for marking.
95. First part of a two semester course.
96. Course completed. . . standing granted.
97. Has not completed the course.
98. Departmental examination.

APPENDIX D

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION
Vancouver School Board

January 23, 1973.

TO PARENTS OF STUDENTS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS USING COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS:

Our school practices are constantly being revised so that we may keep pace with technological change and at the same time we are continuing to consider the needs and interests of all students. It is in this context that we are attempting now to evaluate the use of computerized report cards. Your responses to the following questions will be helpful and we would be grateful if you would return the completed questionnaire to the school.

Rank in order of interest the questions that you would like to have answered about the progress of your son or daughter in school. (Place the number 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 to indicate the ranking you would give to each of these questions.)

How is my son/daughter progressing in his/her studies? ☐

Is he/she working hard enough? ☐

How does he/she behave in school? ☐

Does he/she get along well with his/her fellow pupils? ☐

Is my son/daughter happy in school? ☐

IN RESPONSE TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS, PLEASE ENTER IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT THE NUMBER OF THE ANSWER THAT BEST EXPRESSES YOUR OPINION.

How do you find the report card? ☐

1. easy to read
2. fairly easy to read
3. fairly difficult to read
4. very difficult to read

Which one of the following ways would you prefer for the evaluation of your son's/daughter's progress? ☐

1. achievement in relation to his/her own ability
2. a comparison with progress of other students
3. a comparison with a prescribed standard of achievement
4. a combination of 1 and 2
5. a combination of 1 and 3
6. a combination of 1, 2 and 3
7. other (state)_____

Which of the following reporting systems do you prefer for indicating progress? [For example, the present system is a combination of Letter Grades (A, B, C, etc.) and Teachers' Comments by Subject.] ☐

1. Letter Grades, only
2. Symbols, only
3. Percentage Marks, only
4. "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory"
5. Teachers' Comments by Subject
6. Symbols and Comments, only
7. Letter Grades and Comments, only
8. Percentage Marks and Comments
9. Letter Grades and Percentage Marks
10. Other (state it)_____

Which method of reporting do you like best? ☐

1. Report Cards
2. Parent-teacher conferences
3. A combination of these
4. Conferences, only when requested
5. Report cards and conferences only when requested
6. Other (Please state)_____

Select one of the following and enter its number in the box at the right ☐

1. The number of parent-teacher conferences is sufficient.
2. More parent-teacher conferences are needed.
3. Fewer parent-teacher conferences are needed.

At the present time, the computer prints one comment per course. ☐

1. One teacher comment per course is sufficient.
2. There should be an allowance for two comments per course.
3. There should be an allowance for more than two comments per course.

How many times during the year would you like to have a report on your son's/daughter's progress in school? Place the number in the box at the right. ☐

FOR QUESTIONS 13-16 ENTER IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT A "1" FOR YES OR A "0" FOR NO.

In general, are you satisfied with the report card? ☐

Do you wish to be told the number of days that your son/daughter has been absent from school? ☐

Do you wish to be told the number of times that your son/daughter has been absent from each subject class? ☐

Do you feel that the computerized comments are sufficiently detailed? ☐

Please record on the back of this page any suggestions you would wish to make regarding the methods presently being used to report your child's progress in school.

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE TO TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS RE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS

IN RESPONSE TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS PLEASE ENTER IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT THE NUMBER OF THE ANSWER THAT BEST EXPRESSES YOUR OPINION.

In what capacity are you answering this questionnaire? 1 ☐

1. Teacher
2. Administrator

Has the use of computerized report cards reduced the amount of time you spend in the production of report cards? 2 ☐

1. Yes
2. No

Have you found that the number of errors on report cards has decreased under the computerized report system? 3 ☐

1. Yes
2. No

In your opinion, how do you think the number of students that receive comments under the computerized reporting system compares with the number under the manual system? 4 ☐

1. More students receive comments under the computerized system.
2. Fewer students receive comments under the computerized system.
3. About the same number of students receive comments under the two systems.

In your opinion, how does the range of comments given to students compare under the two systems? 5 ☐

1. A wider range of comments is used under the computerized system.
2. A narrower range of comments is used under the computerized system.
3. The range of comments is about the same under both systems.

How do you feel about the number of computer-printed comments produced per course on the report card? 6 ☐

1. One comment per course is sufficient.
2. There should be an allowance for two comments per course.
3. There should be an allowance for three or more comments per course.

Under the manual reporting system approximately what percentage of your students received more than one comment per course? 7 ☐

1. Over 75%
2. 50-75%
3. 25-50%
4. 0-25%

Under the computerized reporting system, approximately what percentage of your students received write-in comments? 8 ☐

1. Over 50%
2. 30-50%
3. 10-30%
4. 0-10%

Listed below are eight items produced under the computerized report card system. For each item, indicate the extent of its value to you in terms of usefulness and amount of time saved by entering one of the following numbers in the box to the right of the item:

1. extremely beneficial
2. beneficial
3. of little value
4. of no value to me
5. has not been produced at our school

Class lists 9 ☐

Biographical information 10 ☐

Honour roll 11 ☐

Permanent record card labels 12 ☐

Marks analysis 13 ☐

Address labels 14 ☐

Analysis of the use of comments 15 ☐

Carbon copies for counsellors' files and school office file 16 ☐

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE TO COUNSELLORS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS RE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS

IN RESPONSE TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS PLEASE ENTER IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT THE NUMBER OF THE ANSWER THAT BEST EXPRESSES YOUR OPINION.

In what capacity are you answering this questionnaire? 1 ☐

1. Counsellor
2. Committee Member

Has the use of computerized report cards reduced the amount of time you spend in the production of report cards? 2 ☐

1. Yes
2. No

Have you found that the number of errors on report cards has decreased under the computerized report system? 3 ☐

1. Yes
2. No

How do you feel about the number of computer-printed comments produced per course on the report card? 4 ☐

1. One comment per course is sufficient.
2. There should be an allowance for two comments per course.
3. There should be an allowance for three or more comments per course.

Listed below are eight items produced under the computerized report card system. For each item, indicate the extent of its value to you in terms of usefulness and amount of time saved by entering one of the following numbers in the box to the right of the item:

1. extremely beneficial
2. beneficial
3. of little value
4. of no value to me
5. has not been produced at our school

Class lists 5 ☐

Biographical information 6 ☐

Honour roll 7 ☐

Permanent record card labels 8 ☐

Marks analysis 9 ☐

Address labels 10 ☐

Analysis of the use of comments 11 ☐

Carbon copies for counsellors' files and school office file 12 ☐

Master Revision Cards are produced in the spring to enable students to choose courses for the following year. How useful are the up-to-date listings of courses taken and marks received?

13 ☐

1. Extremely useful
2. Useful
3. Not very useful
4. Not useful at all

In your present position, what do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of computerized report cards? What suggestions do you have for improvement? Some of the areas of use that might be considered are as follows:

1. Administration
2. Clerical purposes
3. Counselling
4. Instructional purposes
5. Services to students
6. Communications with parents

You need comment only on those areas which apply directly to your position.

Area of Use	Advantages	Disadvantages	Suggestions for Improvement

APPENDIX G

QUESTIONNAIRE TO CLERICAL STAFF RE COMPUTERIZED REPORT CARDS

IN RESPONSE TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS PLEASE ENTER IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT THE NUMBER OF THE ANSWER THAT BEST EXPRESSES YOUR OPINION.

Has the use of computerized report cards reduced the amount of time you spend in the production of report cards? 1 ☐

1. Yes
2. No

Have you found that the number of errors on report cards has decreased under the computerized report system? 2 ☐

1. Yes
2. No

Listed below are eight items produced under the computerized report card system. For each item, indicate the extent of its value to you in terms of usefulness and amount of time saved by entering one of the following numbers in the box to the right of the item:

1. extremely beneficial
2. beneficial
3. of little value
4. of no value to me
5. has not been produced at our school

Class lists 3 ☐

Biographical information 4 ☐

Honour roll 5 ☐

Permanent record card labels 6 ☐

Marks analysis 7 ☐

Address labels 8 ☐

Analysis of the use of comments 9 ☐

Carbon copies for counsellors' files and school office file 10 ☐

In your present position, what do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of computerized report cards? What suggestions do you have for improvement? Some of the areas of use that might be considered are as follows:

1. Administration
2. Clerical purposes
3. Counselling
4. Instructional purposes
5. Services to students
6. Communications with parents

You need comment only on those areas which apply directly to your position.

Area of Use	Advantages	Disadvantages	Suggestions for Improvement

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DODDS, W., "How to Use V.S.B. Computerized Report Cards System", Vancouver School Board, November, 1972.

DURWARD, M. Lynne, "Computerized Scheduling in Vancouver Schools," April, 1973, Research Report 73-05, Dept. of Planning and Evaluation, Vancouver School Board.

GILBERT, Katherine J. and E. N. Ellis "An Evaluation of Current Methods to Report Pupil Progress", June 8, 1972, Research Report 72-08, Dept. of Planning and Evaluation, Vancouver School Board.

JOHNSON, M. Clemens, Educational Uses of the Computer: An Introduction, Chicago; Rand McNally & Company, 1971.

WHITLOCK, James W., Automatic Data Processing in Education New York: McMillan, 1964.

"Report Cards Run Off on Computer", School Progress, 39:36-37, February, 1970.